

REMARKS

In the Office Action of September 12, 2008, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2005/0009605 A1 (“Rosenberg et al.”). In addition, claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rosenberg et al. or over Rosenberg et al. in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0020690 A1 (“Chen et al.”), U.S. Patent No. 6,078,312 (“Liebenow”) and/or U.S. Patent No. 7,046,229 (“Drake”).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 10 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Rosenberg et al. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Rosenberg et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of pending claims 1-18.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1 and 10

As amended, the amended independent claim 1 recites in part “*said map being a reference image of said surface of said moveable element that is larger than said image of said sub-area on said surface formed by said imaging element such that said image corresponds to a portion of said reference image,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Rosenberg et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Rosenberg et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Office Action on pages 2 and 3 states that the cited reference of Rosenberg et al. discloses “a memory including a map that specifies said readable pattern in each sub-area on said surface that can be imaged by said imaging element (paragraph [0018], U.S. Pat. No. 5,644, 139 (abstract) which is incorporated by reference).” In addition, the Office Action on page 7 states that “[a]lthough Allen doesn’t specifically disclose ‘a map’, the stored images as disclosed by Allen is an equivalent of the map as claimed as they ‘specify said readable pattern in each sub-area on said surface that can be imaged by said imaging element.’”

The cited reference of Rosenberg et al. in paragraph [0018] describes a movement detector 18 of a device 10 for controlling a video game. The movement detector 18 is described in paragraph [0018], lines 10-12, as detecting movement of a reference surface based on comparisons between images of the reference surface that are captured by an imager 16. Since the compared images are captured by the same imager 16, these images are same sized images. Thus, none of these images can be considered to be equivalent to the claimed “map” that is “*a reference image of said surface of said moveable element that is larger than said image of said sub-area on said surface formed by said imaging element such that said image corresponds to a portion of said reference image,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

The cited reference of Allen et al. discloses a scanning device and method for forming a scanned electronic image. In the abstract, the cited reference of Allen et al. states that “the accumulated displacement value obtained from consecutive frames is updated by comparing a current frame with a much earlier frame stored in memory.” The current frame and the earlier frame are acquired using a navigation sensor, as described with reference to Fig. 7 in Allen et al. These current and earlier frames are same sized images since these images are acquired using the same navigation sensor. Thus, neither of these frames can be considered to be equivalent to the claimed “map” that is “*a reference image of said surface of said moveable element that is larger than said image of said sub-area on said surface formed by said imaging element such that said image corresponds to a portion of said reference image,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

Since Rosenberg et al. and Allen et al. do not disclose the claimed limitation

of “*said map being a reference image of said surface of said moveable element that is larger than said image of said sub-area on said surface formed by said imaging element such that said image corresponds to a portion of said reference image,*” the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Rosenberg et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claim 10, which recites limitations similar to those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 10 is also not anticipated by the cited reference of Rosenberg et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 10 be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-9 and 11-18

Each of the dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1 and 10. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Koay et al.

Date: December 16, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300